The University of Chicago

THE FUNDAMENTAL UNITY OF INDIAN THOUGHT

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

JUNE, 1943

By
ALEXANDER AITKEN RATTRAY

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1946

The University of Chicago

THE FUNDAMENTAL UNITY OF INDIAN THOUGHT

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

JUNE, 1943

By
ALEXANDER AITKEN RATTRAY

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1946

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

No one can read Indian literature without becoming aware that in spite of apparently irreconcilable differences the variegated systems of religion have a great many things in common. All use a common fund of philosophical terms and illustrations; there is a more or less uniform system of logic; nearly all the systems include in their epistemology knowledge acquired in supra-conscious states, and the Sūtra-writers seem to have had access to a common stock of aphorisms and meanings.

More important still the goal of all religions is ultimately the same--Escape from the Wheel of Saṃsāra, the surfeit of immortality engendered by the linkage into a rigidly unbreakable determinism of the twin concepts of Karma and Transmigration. The methods of securing this Release differ radically, but once again common factors are involved in the process of obtaining Redemption, and Ahiṃsā, Yoga, and Asceticism appear in varying degree in all systems alike--āstika or nāstika, idealistic or theistic, in the Vedānta as in the sectarian forms of Hinduism.

Most scholars are agreed that some underlying unity does exist, but they are in radical disagreement as to exactly what such unity consists of, what the chief factors in shaping it have been, and what the exact process was which finally produced the pattern we now have. One reason for this marked divergence of opinion has certainly been the absence of any one consistent methodology--something scarcely to be wondered at when we realize that a strictly scientific methodology in the field of the religious sciences is a comparatively recent development. The result of this lack, however, has been unwarranted speculation offered as "explanations" of the many problems in this field. Typical has been the endeavour to explain the "Weltschmerz" which so quickly replaced the characteristic Vedic optimism and turned the face of the Indian away from this world to seek elsewhere for Reality. Thus Gough supposed the Dravidian influence to have

been relatively slight, basing his claims on a description of the aborigines as savages of a low cultural sort whose influence must have been largely confined to the fringes of the dominant and superior Aryan civilization. The later excavations at Mohenjo-daro as presented by Sir John Marshall have entirely destroyed any such theory.

Other writers have betrayed a manifest bias. Indian writers have consistently described the recurrence of sex elements in their religion as "degenerations" from high philosophic doctrines, occurring relatively late in the literature, and being in fact a kind of devolution at a late date in the development. This sort of bias ignores both the cultural interaction and its history, and makes the origin of a sect synonymous with its philosophical justification in the literature. It actually reverses the true process in which a social group attains sufficient importance to demand recognition within the orthodox pale and secures intellectual status through its apologists who effect the necessary philosophical rapprochement.

Some Western scholars, notably Deussen and the German Idealists, sought to unify Indian thought on the basis of an original idealism. Still others have accepted the interpretation of the Indian Vedāntists who claim that Śaṅkara represented the terminus of a logical development rooted in the Vedas, which provided a fundamental unity against which "orthodoxy" all other positions must be contrasted. This position is also that of all the astika sects of whatever description, monistic idealist or theistic, a position they maintain against the rest with all the fervour of the Arminian-Predestinarian controversialists of last century Christianity.

Christian writers like Sidney Cave have generally found themselves in agreement with the monistic idealism of the Vedānta, since for them too Religion was best defined as the effort of the soul of man to find unity with the great Over-soul of the Universe-but the sex-fertility cults were as taboo to such as the Canaanite sex worship was to the priests of Jaweh. Conversely Western apologists for the Śāktas such as Arthur Avalon, Sir John Woodroffe, have sought to show that behind the crude sex symbolism lay the high philosophic goal of union of the human soul with the Creator of the Universe, Brahman, again ignoring the historical development.

This apparently inescapable bias, present in both Western and Indian writers, makes it hard to apply a rigorous method to the materials, something which is rendered still more difficult by the notorious inexactness of Indian chronology, thus allowing those bent on exploiting a bias altogether too much latitude. In spite of these handicaps it should still be possible to make an objective and scientific evaluation of the development of Indian thought--if for no other reason than the fact that it is fairly easy to gauge the bias of the Indian writers, who usually make no attempt to conceal their religious affiliations or philosophic a prioris, while the Western Idealists are obvious, as are the conscious or unconscious apologists for Christian or Western values and the Western apologists for Indian sects like Mrs. Stevenson or Arthor Avalon. In every case, as one Indian scholar has very succinctly put it, "a bias recognized is a bias sterillized."

Thus, although the fact of a fundamental unity of Indian thought has been tacitly agreed to by a majority of orientalists, yet none has come to the study with a consistently scientific and unbiassed methodological approach--although until this has been attempted no true perspective of the religious and philosophical development of Indian thought is possible. Such an objective study, moreover, would be a genuine contribution to our knowledge of Indian development, and such is the task which has been attempted in this thesis. From as objective an appraisal of the facts as it has been possible to make, the endeavour has been made to show that the seemingly separate and independent Indian systems are really members of a larger whole, the product of social pressure and interaction between the religious ideas of the Aryan and those of the aboriginal or pre-Aryan inhabitants of the land. This introduces the question of just what ideas the Dravidians were responsible for and how the introduction of these was effected.

It has been shown clearly how the Aryan religion, a nature worship centered in a high sky-god and guaranteeing the values of a hunting, semi-nomadic culture, was superimposed upon an agricultural culture whose religion was one of the Mediterranean fertility and mother-goddess type. In such a situation the overwhelming tendency would be for the newcomers to take over without significant change the rituals and cult practices and use these to secure the new values which his own gods were impotent

to provide. And since, in addition, the remains excavated at Mohenjo-daro and Harappa conclusively demonstrate that the culture of the pre-Aryan population of India was on a much higher level than that of their conquerors, this tendency would be furthered by the preponderant mass of the Dravidian peoples inculcating a social pressure which would make eventual assimilation inevitable.

This has actually been the history of Indian culture--the record of a continuing and progressive modification of the superimposed Aryan culture by that of the native population, marked by the constant entrance of non-Aryan groups into Hindu society. It is a process quite similar to the trend manifested by Greek religion, where the two strata of Homeric and pre-Homeric religion are still clearly discernible, although only a few deities of Aryan origin survived the process of interaction--notably Hestia and the great Zeus himself. In India, however, the assimilating process was furthered by the eclecticism of the Hindu priests who made the criteria of orthodoxy the willingness to acknowledge the supremacy of the Brahmin priest and do the "Dharma," the religio-social-political organization of the group, comparable to the Chinese "Li," which enfolded the individual from birth until death and gave him whatever security he had. This was augmented by the sacrificial system addressed to the various gods, which guaranteed the values of the religious ideal and added a compensatory existence in another world.

There is little doubt that the Aryans had scarcely settled down in the Punjab before much the same process of interaction as that which took place in Greece commenced. Some of the Aryan Gods lost their usefulness while others attained to new prominence because of the new climatic and changed environmental factors, and so Varuṇa, the high ethical sky-god of the Aryans yields his place to Indra, and the Asuras yield place to the Devas. A Pantheon similar to that of the Greek religion might have emerged at length, but instead the rise of the sacrifice to the point of becoming a Theurgy depressed both Gods and men in status and elevated the priests themselves into the position of "Human Gods" because of their control of the sacrifice. It is Jaweh and the Baalim all over again, the struggle of the ethical Varuṇa of the semi-nomads against the techniques of a sacrificial fertility religion--and Varuṇa is defeated.

The entrance of these various elements into the Aryan reli-

gion corresponds fairly well with the tempo of their advance from the Punjab to the banks of the Ganges. There is no asceticism, yoga, ahiṃsā, refusal of life or pessimism, no temples, shrines, images, sacred places or the like, no philosophic speculation concerning the origin of things, the problem of suffering or the fate of the wicked, seen in the Rig-Veda (excepting the later tenth book) probably the only book originating outside of Brahma-land and the Ganges area. The Rig was probably collected in the first place in reaction to the presence of the alien Gods of the land, and it portrays the simple nature worship and ethical religion of a "Yea-saying," life-loving people. There is little sign of the idea of retribution in this religion whose gods are as simple and human as their worshippers. In the later tenth book of the Rig, however, speculation begins, and progressively the scriptures begin to show the entrance of non-Aryan elements and ideas, until in the Atharva-Veda and the Brāhmaṇas a sacrificial religion of rite and spell, non-ethical and mechanical in operation develops, administered by the priests now all powerful through their control of the sacrificial techniques.

This degradation of the Gods coincides with the search for an Absolute and with the introduction of the ideas of Karma and Transmigration. Asceticism and the yoga experience defined the nature of this Absolute and the nature also of the human soul, thus giving rise to the famous Ātman-Brahman equation which was held to be the answer to the pessimism and world-refusal engendered by the linkage of Karma and Transmigration into a rigid determinism. Reality was held to be the Absolute, and the corollary to this was the doctrine of the unreality of the world which was now Māyā--a lesser level of reality. The goal of religion had now become escape from the chains of Rebirth--world refusal and world flight. Thus at one stroke the Sacrifice and all this-worldly values were done away with, theoretically speaking. But the Brahmins did not accept deposition nor abdicate. Instead they merely superimposed the new religious goal upon the old sacrificial system, making this the ideal to which all the rest was a necessary prelude. In this they were supported by the realistic this-worldliness of the masses, who perforce had to remain in the world and seek the security of the "Dharma" with its sacrificial reinforcement and theistic guarantees. So great was this pressure that eventually even the intellectuals and philosophers had to

make some concession to it, and this was done by the great Śaṅkara through his doctrine of Kramamukti, which gave salvation on the empirical side of his system by devotion to Iśvara, the Lower Brahman. This provided a method whereby the priests could effect a juncture with the theism of the non-Aryan groups as well as with that of their own people. Brahman was by definition ineffable, and so any God could be regarded as a "Broken Light" of Him, and Devotion (Bhakti) could give Release. True! ultimately salvation presupposed the teaching of Jñāna which was therefore still the Higher Way, but practically its effect was to confer salvation by the old theistic approach, and, of course the Gods could still confer this-worldly benefits-which were really worthless, since all was Māyā. This left things much as they were, with the Brahmins still in effective control.

It has therefore been clearly demonstrated that it was the continual penetration of the Aryan religion by these Dravidian ideas which changed the whole outlook and orientation of the Aryan, and we have seen how the Brahmin priest retained control, and how his eclectic attitude was perhaps the greatest single factor in facilitating the introduction of ever more reinforcements of these non-Aryan ideas because of his willingness to grant recognition to whatever group was powerful enough to challenge his self-interest as the inevitable process of interaction and assimilation proceeded. Another factor in the process was the nature of Hinduism itself which was "What the Hindu did," and not what he believed--the "Dharma" as over against a creed. Hence there was no difference between political and religious movements, or between philosophy and theology. The common man sought the theistic guarantee of the social values enshrined in the "Dharma," the philosopher escape from this world--both were utilitarian systems, for the intellectual sought union with the Absolute as a means to an end--union was not an end in itself, and it followed logically that salvation might be obtained by other means in systems which had no God or Soul. This fact and the nature of the Hindu absolute, which gave countenance to any God, and the Brahmin eclecticism referred to above, produced an "Orthodoxy" which rested but lightly upon the "Authority" of the Vedas, and because of the many variable factors present in any attempt to interpret "Authority," the line between Āstika and Nāstika systems was but finely drawn in consequence, and the conflux of all these tendencies and factors

spelled ever more rapid syncretism, and assimilation of the Aryan religion and culture.

In the Atharva-Veda, therefore, we have the presence of rite and spell of a purely mechanical and unethical type, and the identification there of many of the Gods of the land with Aryan deities. The Atharva and Yajur-Vedas mirror the advance from the Punjab to the Ganges where in Brahmaland, the home of the Brahminical culture, the thinly-spread Aryans were in the closest and most intimate contact with the non-Aryan culture and people. Here the intrusion of cult forms and ideas is reflected in the literature in the changing attitude towards Woman, the Cow and the Śūdra. Here too the Śiva cult enters Hinduism, and with it comes much sex and fertility ritual, the Lingam as a cult object, the cult of female deities, temples, images and sacred places. Here too Karma and Transmigration enter and give rise to that speculation which later on culminated in the Weltschmerz we have been discussing, and which gave rise to Escape as the new religious goal. The entry and reinforcement of these ideas in Śruti marks the entry into Hinduism of groups whose dominant characteristics were couched in terms of asceticism, Yoga, Bhakti, and so on, and whose beliefs had to come to terms with the current Hindu philosophy--a task which their apologists easily performed. This task was a vital one, for the dominant stress of any group cannot be arbitrarily discarded since it rests on the value quest and hopes of the people themselves--it can only be restated in terms of the new religious climate and ideal. Thus the literature does not represent a unilateral development or unified philosophy, growing from within by means of resident forces, but rather it represents an unsystematic agglomeration of materials and unrelated theories. This is true of the Vedas themselves but especially so of the Upaniṣads, the natural repository of such materials. These later were not therefore an articulated system, as many have sought to declare, but are instead the grouping of the diverse elements of this syncretistic process, without much regard for historical order, around a common nucleus--the quest for an Absolute.

It is hardly to be wondered at, therefore, that diverse systems could find common rootage in materials of this description, and that these represent no more than the attempt by the apologists of the various schools or groups to systematize this mass of scripture in the interests of their own particular teachings.

Thus the erection of a system was conditioned by the attempt to take in as much of this "Scripture" as was possible, and also by the fact that there were two predominant strands manifest in this material--the idealistic and the realistic. The attempt to build a system was also hampered by the tendency of ancient teachings, belonging to an earlier era, suddenly to assert their time-hallowed rights and demand recognition in the system now a-building. The tenuous nature of "Authority," due to the many variable factors implicit in it, was no bar to the freedom of the system-builder, while, as we have seen, "Orthodoxy" encouraged such syncretism rather than hindered it. But no maker of a system, or commentator, however able and untrammelled he might be, could from the very nature of things ever hope to include all the diverse Upaniṣadic material, or systematize the diverse trends, or give equal weight and similar treatment to all the texts of Śṛuti; and none could legitimately lay claim to being the custodian of a pure and uncorrupt "Doctrine of the Upaniṣads," or claim to be the "Essential Teaching of the Upaniṣads," although many in effect did so.

It is from such sectarians that the chief opposition to the point of view which regards Indian thought as the product of a socially conditioned interaction between Aryan and pre-Aryan religious ideas comes. The Indian Vedāntist regards Śaṅkara as the terminal point on a line of evolution which began with Yājñavalkhya and continued through Bādarāyana to Saṅkara, who is therefore the exponent of the "true" teaching of the Upaniṣads, which have, therefore, an "Essential Doctrine." The Western Absolute Idealists, such as Paul Deussen, claim that the Upaniṣads to a very real extent foreshadow Plato and Kant, and that there exists a "True" "Doctrine of the Upaniṣads," containing "a definite doctrine of Idealism which is variously broken down by realistic intrusions and accommodations to common sense." As regards the latter position our findings for the reasons advanced must be in accord with Keith's dictum that any such position "is one which is contrary to all probability and reason." Deussen's position is untenable and merely a "Tour de Force."

As to the point of view of the Vedāntists our examination of Bādarāyana's Sūtras and Śaṅkara's Bhāshya shows essential differences, Bādarāyana being closer to Rāmānuja and the Bhāgavadas than to Śaṅkara. These differences were shown to be due to the unsystematic character of the Upaniṣadic material and their divi-

sion into idealistic and realistic types, and to the fact that both men represented a definite tradition, while each had to make purely subjective choices between the contradictory teachings present within his own school. The study is convincing and illustrates the sheer futility of seeking for any innate or well-articulated system inherent in the Upaniṣads. There is no such "Doctrine of the Upaniṣads" that can be legitimately equated with German Absolute Idealism, but any of the various systems can lay as legitimate claim as the next to being "Orthodox."

To prove that this view of the relationship between the various philosophical systems was the correct one, and that their fundamental unity was of the kind we have postulated, namely that each was a genuine product of the interaction of the factors we have been considering, a reflection of the process of assimilation in terms of the formative agents promoting and furthering that process, an examination of several of the more prominent religious systems was made beginning with the Sāṃkhya. The results of that study proved conclusively that the Sāṃkhya, on the basis of its treatment of the Upanishadic materials, had as genuine a claim to represent that material as had the Vedānta of Śaṅkara.

Śaṅkara's system was found to be inconsistent in many points--simply because no complete systematization was possible, as we have already pointed out, and because his idealistic bias, while it permitted him to appropriate easily and utilize freely the materials of this nature in the Upaniṣads without obvious straining, yet forced him to reinterpret and strain the realistic and theistic materials in the interests of his system--although these were as genuinely "Scriptural," and had at least equal validity with the idealistic texts. Śaṅkara also describes these early materials as "accommodations" of higher truth (Idealism) to man's limited understanding, just as Deussen did, an obvious "Tour de Force." His concepts of Māyā, Higher and Lower Brahman, and so forth, are his own contribution necessitated by the exigencies of his idealism, and, as Thibaut pointed out, foreign to Bādarāyana, whose Sūtras Śaṅkara claims to be commenting upon.

Kapila is guilty of exactly the same kind of thing. The realistic materials he takes freely, but has to strain to accommodate the idealistic texts. The theories and lines of thought he follows are present in the Upaniṣads, as are the realistic tendencies which characterize his system. In all of his teaching

Kapila follows the traditional patterns of Hindu thought, acknowledges the "Authority" of Scripture, and claims "Orthodoxy" therefore. His system is the logical result of the realistic emphasis of the Sāṃkhya School, and, although it is atheistic, yet the goal of Escape is attained through Idealism as in the Vedānta of Śaṅkara. Thus both Vedānta and Sāṃkhya are real products of the Upaniṣads, equally "Orthodox" and representative of these, but neither can claim to be the "Essential Teaching of the Upaniṣads."

Exactly the same results were attained by an examination of Rāmānuja's Śri-Bhāshya. Rāmānuja has to keep the values of a personal God, and he too represents an old and weighty tradition. He too claims to teach only the "Truths" of the Upaniṣads, but he rationalizes those idealistic texts which speak of an attributeless Absolute, while taking those which speak of qualities just as they are. He finds the Brahma-Sūtra easy to digest, since it is definitely in line with his own school and tradition more so than with that of Śaṅkara--but his method is exactly similar to that of the other Bhāshya writers--frankly apologetic. His interpretation of Śruti is conditioned by his a prioris as a sectarian, and his Śri-Bhāshya is largely an attack upon Śaṅkara's Māyā, Higher and Lower Brahman, and Higher and Lower Knowledge. But Rāmānuja too can claim to be as much in accord with the Upaniṣads as Śaṅkara, Bādarāyana, Kapila, or the rest--although his system cannot lay claim to being the "Essential Teaching" of the Upaniṣads any more than these others can.

In all of these systems we have seen the many common factors as we went along. The illustrations, philosophic terminology, the logic used, and the epistemology employed were common to all the members, as were the philosophic trends and goal of the sects. All claimed to be orthodox and to adhere to the authority of the Vedas, but Jainism and Buddhism, which ostensibly are nāstika systems, lying beyond the pale of orthodox religion, nevertheless share these same common factors, and are in everything else on a par with the āstika systems. In the background of both the same forces were operative, and although the Brahmins did not succeed in drawing these groups within the pale, yet they did succeed in effecting a real rapprochement with the Jains, and their syncretistic methods largely neutralized the effectiveness of the Buddhist teaching, so that when the Mohammedans destroyed their monasteries Buddhism largely died out of India and became a missionary Salva-

tion-by-Faith technique in the farther East.

The predominant religious climate in the district in which both Buddhism and Jainism arose was Asceticism, and this was restated in terms of the Sāṃkya philosophy so that in both a form or derivative of this pre-Aryan asceticism became the key which effected release from Karma. In Jainism the Sāṃkhya influence shows in the retention of the puruṣa, with this difference that now the puruṣa can be affected by action, a necessity if some form of Ascetic action was to effect Release from Saṃsāra. The original Buddhism developed one of the original underlying stresses of the Sāṃkhya to its logical end in the denial of the puruṣa as well as the Supreme Ātman, something which had to be done if Release was to be had from the dissolution of the Skhāndas through an ascetic discipline, even if it was a "Middle Way" between extremes. Thus in both of these systems we see the Aryan pessimism, which was itself the result of this pre-Aryan asceticism, and which had given rise to the new religious goal of Escape, being reinforced again by this same ancient asceticism now offered anew as the effective means of securing Release from the problem it had itself been largely instrumental in creating.

Thus even the nastika systems share the same fundamental unity of thought in which the others partake, and with them form part of a larger whole. From this brief survey of the results of an examination of the course of Indian religious development it has been clearly and definitely shown that even if we are uncertain as to the exact ethnic mixture which produced the Dravidian or pre-Aryan stock, we can be certain that they had a high level of culture and a well-developed religious system. This religion was of the fertility type as the Mohenjo-daro excavations and the parallels with the contemporary Mediterranean culture prove, and at the same time it had also present in it elements of ascetic and monastic morality such as are present in the Buddhist and Jain Birth stories and in the Mahābhārata and Purāṇas. This may be inferred from the total absence of all such elements in the Ṛig-Veda, even as they are absent from Zoroaster's Gathas.

It is not at all necessary to derive this asceticism from the Vedic literary materials, for from the absence of all indications of the ascetic mentality and even of philosophic speculation from the early nine books of the Ṛig-Veda, this so un-Aryan outlook must be presumed to have come from some more ancient source--

the religious outlook of the aboriginal inhabitants. The Asceticism of the Vedas which resulted in the Karma-Transmigration determinism and the rise of the new religious ideal of Release, was therefore a derivative of this non-Aryan religious ideal, which was later on reinforced from the same source when the Hindu eclecticism began to accept and justify large and powerful sects of the non-Aryan population as they did.

The reason behind this eclecticism was the fact of social pressure, steadily increasing as the process of interaction and assimilation between the two groups went steadily on. It was this sociological pressure which influenced the Brahmins who showed a great willingness to accommodate themselves to new groups with diverse religious ideals in order to retain their position of authority and the perquisites of office.

In this aim they were assisted by the development of the Hindu Absolute which permitted all Gods to be regarded as phases of itself. For the rest identification of the new Gods with Vedic deities and submission to the Brahmin priests was sufficient.

Assisting the incorporation of new religious ideas was the revolt against the growing power of the Brahmins, Kshāttriya led, which coincided with the continuation of the speculative trend manifested in the tenth book of the Rig-Veda through Brāhmaṇas and Arāṇyakas to culminate in the determinism of the Upaniṣads, the ideal of Escape, the rise of the Absolute and its equation to the Jiva of man, and the rise of the heretical systems. These soon were accepted by the Brahman eclecticism and these diverse goals became "Orthodox." The other vital factor in this process was the contact with the non-Aryan Gods and religious concepts which increased as the Aryans advanced eastward and became more thinly spread over the subject population until the advance was finally stopped along the banks of the Ganges. The development of speculation coincides with this. It is very probable that the Māntras of the Rig-Veda were first collected in response to the presence of the non-Aryan Gods and religion--the speculation in the tenth book being a further indication of the presence of alien ideas, and this speculation increases as the eastward advance continues.

The Brahmins retained their authority by reason of their eclecticism and talent for synthesis, and also because of the connection between the Vedas, Caste, Karma and Transmigration, and

because they stayed close to the common folks who were interested in a real life and its goods, real benefits from real Gods--and these the Brahmins controlled through the sacrifice. Thus the Brahmins were able to outlast nearly every new religious development including the Jains and Buddhists who denied the authority of the Vedas and were supposedly outside the pale of Hinduism.

This realistic theism, which influenced the development of the various philosophic justifications claiming to be "Orthodox," was reinforced by the incoming non-Aryan cults who brought in a theism which supported that of the Vedas. This Vedic theism developed through pantheism into the Vedic Absolute, which itself was the object of devoted worship, and this trend forced Śaṅkara to evolve his Lower Brahman, Iśvara, as an accommodation. The same pressure conditioned the rise to power at this time of the Hindu Trinity, Viṣnu, Śiva and Brāhma, since Śaṅkara's Iśvara was not entirely satisfying to the common folk. Each of these three was equated with the Lower Brahman, but the apologists for theism generally identified them with the Supreme Brahman himself. This was the reason for the appearance of Āvatars of the Gods, who were thus transcendentalized out of reach so that some such device was necessary. Śiva made use of his consort's Shākti for the same end. Some of these philosophic justifications, Rāmānuja's for instance, are in the interest of a non-Aryan group in process of assimilation into Hinduism. Others reflect the Kshāttriya inspired heretical development.

All such philosophies, however, are tied up to the Vedic "Orthodoxy" and one is as valid as the next. Some may include more of the materials than others but there is no "essential doctrine" innate in the Upaniṣads which could be used as a standard to designate one system as the "True" Upaniṣadic doctrine as over against another. This is so because the Upaniṣads are compilations including diverse materials from different ages grouped around a nucleus of central ideas. Generally speaking these materials fall roughly into two main classes, the theistic and realistic materials and materials of a decidedly idealistic trend. In addition an examination of the systems of Śaṅkara, Kapila and Rāmānuja shows each of these men as representing a definite tradition or school of thought, recognized as authentic and in line with the Upaniṣads. The interpretations they give make use of the same materials, but each chooses the theistic or idealistic

materials which best suit his system and proceeds to incorporate the materials of the other tradition by a process of rationalizing and dialectic.

After the Brahmins had adopted the goal of Release all systems had to follow suit, but often it is merely a formal acknowledgment--the old religious ideal being retained and advanced anew as the key to Release in accord with the new demands. Thus the sects representing non-Aryan elements in process of assimilation import Bhakti, Devotion, which becomes in Ramanuja's justification synonymous with Knowledge and the new means by which Release is obtained. Yoga, which is non-Aryan but penetrates into every system, itself becomes the technique in the system of that name by which Release is obtained, and in all systems it functions as a means to that end. The whole idealistic situation is itself based as much upon Yoga as upon Karma and Transmigration. Yoga and Asceticism equated with Bhakti enable these ancient techniques to become the key to release even in theistic systems where Devotion to a personal God is theoretically the key. The Nāstika systems of Jaina and Buddhist make Asceticism itself the key to Release and their philosophic justification is made in terms of the ancient Sāṃkya philosophy, as one might expect from movements originated by Kshāttriyas. Although the Sāṃkya is atheistic and realistic it gives Release through idealism, but neither Buddhism nor Jainism is idealistic.

In the Śāktas, Śaivite, Vaishnavite and Buddhist Tantras the other element of India's pre-Aryan religion, the fertility mother-goddess and sex element appears. This recrudence occurs quite late in the religious development but is pre-Aryan in origin. This aspect too is given philosophic justification and again Escape is mediated by these age-old techniques, again tied up with Yoga, Māntras and magical spells--the same techniques which appear in the Atharva-Veda as importations from the aboriginal inhabitants, the Atharva itself being composed in "Brahmaland" where the interaction between Aryan and non-Aryan was perhaps greatest.

Indian religion can be described therefore as a process of interaction between the non-Aryan or Dravidian peoples and the superimposed Aryan culture in which the latter was constantly modified by the former in a manner comparable to the development in Greece. Thus the apparently variegated and dissimilar patterns of Indian Religio-Philosophic sects are merely the coloured pat-

terns picked out of the basic warp and woof. For in this process the Aryans were practically assimilated and their rather high type of religion was submerged and all but destroyed without trace by the non-Aryan religious concepts, which, in the long run, proved to be the more powerful. Therefore the basic soul of India, the fundamental religious conceptions upon which all these superstructures are raised, and upon which they all depend, are Asceticism and its derivatives--Yoga, Ahimsā, Equanimity, Austerities, Self-abasement and world refusal--and with these Theism and Devotion to personal Gods, male and female, Karma and Transmigration, Māntras, Yāntras, Spells and Sex-Fertility worship. From these as a background all the later forms of Indian Religion have evolved by a purely sociological process of natural development, conditioned by the various factors we have been describing.

Modern Indian religion still preserves all of these fundamental beliefs together with a leavening of Mohammedan, Christian and Parsee influence. They still exert a very great pressure upon the masses of the common people and to some extent upon the intellectuals who are their apologists. Karma and Transmigration and the goal of Release from the eternal spinning of the Wheel of Saṃsāra are still relatively unchallenged concepts which the modern Indian, like his confrère of the sixth century B.C., still accepts without any significant hesitation. The naked ascetic is still the Holy Man par excellence and world denial is still the hall-mark of the truly religious. Yet underneath all of this the common man in India as elsewhere is mainly concerned with the values of living, which are his real concern and goal in spite of the superstructure that has been raised upon this simple and basic religion by his intellectual leaders. But the masses have never turned their backs upon this world as their leaders have, and to this day they seek the good life in a bettering world--only the bettering has been laid upon the shoulders of the Gods and Bodhisattvas, while the Indian has for the greater part taken refuge in the enfolding Caste system which guarantees him what little security he has, and has done so for nearly three-thousand years. Encased in this suit of protective armor he has shut out a little insecurity, but he has also shut himself into a rigid prison which has effectively isolated him from Change. Today events are on the march and everywhere the world's religions are coming face to face with Crisis to a degree utterly unknown in

previous eras of their history. In this India is beginning to share, and, for the first time in her long history, she is feeling the impact of changes occurring outside her own borders which are forcing her to lay aside her long apathy and become interested in other religions and their efforts to adjust themselves to Crisis and orient themselves to a new conception of the nature of religion and its task in a modern world.